

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 005

CE 034 904

AUTHOR Sokoloff, Natalie J.
TITLE The Changing Nature of Women's Work, 1940-1980: A Theoretical Contribution.
PUB DATE 9 Sep 82
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting (77th, San Francisco, CA, September 9, 1982).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Career Education; Clerical Occupations; Demand Occupations; *Employed Women; *Employment Level; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Patterns; Employment Projections; Futures (of Society); Labor Market; Labor Needs; *Part Time Employment; Salary Wage Differentials; Sales Occupations; *Service Occupations

ABSTRACT

In the post-World War II period, women have been employed in jobs that have been degraded, deskilled, and cheapened. Their employment has increasingly been in the service sector. Data supports the argument that women are treated as secondary workers in the labor market and are not paid as equals to men. Along with the degradation of women's jobs during the period of developing monopoly capitalism, patriarchal relations in the labor force have been maintained or strengthened. The service producing industry has grown as a hedge against recession, and women have increased their participation in the service sector because it is heavily "less than full-time and year-round" (part-time) work. They are structurally incorporated so they remain a reserve of labor for capital at the same time they are employed in wage labor and continue to have primary responsibility for the home and family. The predictions of job increases for the 1980's are for the greatest increases to be in low-level services, sales, and clerical work, categories that are heavily female, lowest wage, and part-time. (YLB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED225005

149-5
Thursday
September 9
8:30 a.m.

THE CHANGING NATURE OF WOMEN'S WORK, 1940-1980:
A THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION

Natalie J. Sokoloff
John Jay College, CUNY

A paper prepared for presentation at the 77th Annual Meeting of the
American Sociological Association, September 6-10, 1982 in San Francisco.

Not for reproduction, quotation, or any other
use without permission of the author, except
for press use after 8:30 a.m., September 9.

*The author would like to thank Fred L. Pincus for his helpful comments.
Thanks also goes to the members of the Women and Work group, originally
sponsored by the ASA, for their criticism and encouragement.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N J Sokoloff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 034 904

Abstract

"The Changing Nature of Women's Work, 1940-1980: A Theoretical Contribution

Natalie J. Sokoloff

This paper focuses on the recent history of the post World War II period to look at the kinds of jobs in which women have increasingly been employed and the sectors of the economy in which their employment has occurred, and how these processes have been beneficial to both capitalist and patriarchal relations alike. In looking at the types of jobs, we discuss the degradation, de-skilling and cheapening of the jobs in which women have been employed; in looking at the economic sectors of female employment, we talk about the increasing participation of women in the service sector and its relationship especially to less than full-time and year-round employment.

It is suggested that only by understanding the way in which 20th century male-dominated monopoly capitalism has worked can we explain women's simultaneously "permanent" and "marginal" position in the labor market today. Clearly, women are permanent members of the labor force in that over two-fifths is made up of female workers. Without women, the economy would fall apart. On the other hand, women's recruitment into increasingly fragmented, low wage, less than year-round and full-time jobs created by the drive for profits and control--which jobs fail to provide security, mobility, job continuity, wages and working conditions which would stabilize the work relationship--maintains and reinforces women's marginalised relationship to the labor market in a variety of ways. In fact, it is argued, the way in which women have been employed in the labor force over the course of contemporary U.S. monopoly capitalism has been to structurally incorporate them so they remain a reserve of labor for capital at the same time that they are employed in wage labor and continue to have primary responsibility for the home and family.

The paper concludes by asking the reader to consider the onslaught of policies harmful to women as espoused by the Reagan administration within its historical context. Thus, while it cannot be argued in any way other than a serious setback of enormous magnitude, the reader is asked to consider the impact of the current legislation of the Reagan administration as such an intensification of "normal" social relations of sex, race and class in the U.S. capitalist market as a genuine and serious setback.

THE CHANGING NATURE OF WOMEN'S WORK, 1940 - 1980:
A THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION

Natalie J. Sokoloff

Introduction

During the 1970s, female employment became an accepted part of contemporary U.S. life, as part of a long-term secular trend. It was different, however, in at least three ways from earlier times:

-First, the sheer numbers of women in the labor force today are huge: in 1979 more than half of all adult women (N= 43 million) were employed.

-Second, women are no longer seen as marginal workers: in 1979 almost three-fourths of all women were employed full-time.

-And third, marital and motherhood statuses no longer impede women's employment as they used to: in 1979, half of all married women and half of all mothers were employed--with the most dramatic rates of increase occurring among mothers with pre-school age children (U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1980b).

However, despite the huge increase in female employment over the 20th century, women continue to be recruited primarily into low status, low paid, sex segregated service sector jobs, lacking job security, adequate benefits or job mobility and discouraging women's full-time, year-round and continuous attachment to particular jobs in the labor force. Thus, women are described as being employed in the secondary as opposed to primary labor market, a structural condition of a dual labor market economy that is disadvantageous to women.

Such a description of the dual labor market economy however has not been adequate in explaining why such divergent markets arose and why women were one of the most significant groups relegated to the secondary labor market. Instead, it has been necessary to look at how the social relations of patriarchy and capitalism have developed over the course of U.S. history for such an explanation (see here Sokoloff, 1980). In this paper we will focus particularly on the recent history of the post World War II period to look at the kinds of jobs in which women have increasingly been employed and the sectors of the economy in which their employment has occurred, and how these processes have been beneficial to both capitalist and patriarchal relations alike. In looking at the types of jobs, we will discuss the degradation, deskilling and cheapening of the jobs in which women have been employed; in looking at the economic sectors of female employment, we will talk about the increasing participation of women in the service sector and its relationship especially to less than full-time and year-round employment.

Most importantly we will suggest that it is only by understanding the way in which 20th century male-dominated monopoly capitalism has worked that we can explain women's simultaneously "permanent" and "marginal" position in the labor market today. Clearly, women are permanent members of the labor force in that over two-fifths (42.5%) is made up of female workers. Without them, the economy would fall apart. On the other hand, women's recruitment increasingly fragmented, low wage, less than year-round & full-time into/jobs created by the drive for profits and control--which jobs fail to provide security, mobility, job continuity, wages

and working conditions which would stabilize the work relationship-- maintains and reinforces women's marginalized relationship to the labor market in a variety of ways. In fact, we will argue, the way in which women have been employed in the labor force over the course of contemporary U.S. monopoly capitalism has been to structurally incorporate them so they remain a reserve of labor for capital at the same time that they are employed in wage labor and continue to have primary responsibility for the home and family.

Before concluding this introduction, I want to suggest that it is important to understand these processes as part of a long-term trend in U.S. society in order for us to evaluate the impact of the current Reagan administration and its devastating effects on women workers. Without such an evaluation, meaningful social policies and actions are not possible. That is, clearly the current legislation of the Reagan administration to increase defense spending and eliminate all kinds of jobs, services, and hard fought-for protections for women, working class people, poor people and people of color represents a genuine and serious setback of enormous magnitude. However, we must ask ourselves whether these setbacks represent a totally new and dramatic step backward, or if they might also be seen as part of an intensification of "normal" social relations of sex, race and class in the U.S. capitalist market. By looking at historical trends in the U.S. labor market prior to the Reagan administration, we hope to provide a much needed gap in the literature. We will do this by looking at women's post World War II employment in 3 stages: 1940-1970; during the 1970s; and projections for women's employment for the 1980s made prior to Reagan's entrance into office.

A Recent History of Women's Employment: 1940 On

A. The Creation of Undesirable Jobs OR How Capital Benefits From Women's Employment

With regard to the changing nature of work and women's employment, I will make use of Dubnoff's (1979) analysis of female employment between 1940 and 1970. He concludes that women have increased their employment in occupations which were "in brief, bad jobs" — and this is true whether they were traditional female jobs or were "mixed sex" jobs and thus less traditionally female.

He found women increased in jobs that were "undesirable by every measure considered here. Females were deployed in occupations which were low in educational training and requirements, as measured by the functional nature of the work rather than educational attainment of incumbents, occupations which were low in complexity, low in autonomy, high in supervision, and above all in occupations which were low paid" (p. 17).

The women were so low paid, according to Dubnoff that "the growth of women's employment was, above all an expansion of low wage work, of work which does not pay the social cost of reproducing the next generation of workers" (p.18). That is, women were recruited into jobs that paid below the minimum necessary wages--below subsistence as defined by government standards. To capital, such workers are a real bargain—they are workers who are paid below cost.

Data on the income paid to men and women employees during the last 40 years shows that women who worked full-time and year-round have been paid on the average, about 60¢ for every \$1 paid to a man. (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1979). This holds true for women at all educational levels and in each occupational category (Deckard,

1975, 1979). Moreover, if one compares all women and all men employed in both full-time and part-time jobs, women fare much worse: according to one estimate they make only 33¢ for every \$1 made by a man (Ehrlich, Sokoloff, Pincus, Ehrlich, 1975).² This is actually a more accurate representation of the wage differential between men and women since women are much more likely to be employed in jobs that are less than full-time and year-round (see below).

These data support the argument that women, on the average, are treated as secondary workers in the US labor market--and thus are not paid as equals to men. This is true despite the fact that 7 out of 10 employed women either have no male partners (43 per cent of employed women are single, separated, widowed or divorced) or live with husbands whose incomes alone are insufficient to keep the family from being poor in 1978 (another 26 per cent of employed women have husbands with incomes of under \$10,000 in 1977) (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1980b, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 2080, 1980).³

B. The Social Relations of Patriarchy in the Labor Market
OR Women's Employment Benefits Men as well as Capital

We can ask the question: "Who benefits from women's low wages?" The standard Marxist argument is that capital benefits. Feminists, on the other hand, ^{sometimes} argue that all men--workers as well as capitalists--benefit from women's poor position in the labor market as well as their low wages. Both, of course, are correct.

Elsewhere I have argued that the systems of patriarchal and capitalist relations operate in both the home and the market. The tendency, however, is to see these as distinct social relations. Thus, contrary to the idea that capitalism operates primarily in the market and patriarchy in the home, I argue that the material and ideological relations of patriarchy operate as much in the market as in the home in contemporary US society (see Sokoloff, 1980). Further, these relations are both reciprocally reinforcing and mutually contradicting.

For example, Dubnoff (1979, p.18) finds that women's employment in low wage jobs makes women both more independent and more dependent on men: while on the one hand women's employment provides the material foundation for greater independence of women from men, it simultaneously solidifies women's economic dependence on men through women's incredibly low wages. In this way, not only capital benefits, but so too does patriarchy.

Some people have argued that patriarchal relations are diminishing both at home and in the market (e.g., see Ginzburg, as reported in "Population Trends..." 1980; Easton, 1978). In the case of the home, Dubnoff has effectively shown us how the material and ideological position of men in the home is both weakened and strengthened by women's ability to work for a wage (but only a low wage) in the market.⁴

In the case of the market, C. Brown (1975) challenges those who say that male domination and control is weakening in American society. As a process, she says "the dialectic of sex within patriarchal capitalism [has moved] from family centered exploitation to industrial centered exploitation of women" (p. 2).

From my own observation of the available data, it seems that patriarchy certainly has not weakened generally in the market; it might even be the case that it has strengthened itself as women have become more and more integrated into the post World War II labor force. (Note: probably both strengthening and weakening forces have gone on.)

There are several different ways we can show that along with the degradation of labor has gone a "patriarchalization" of work—i.e., men benefit both materially and ideologically from the work women do in the market.



The process by which jobs are broken down into smaller, more specialized and simplified parts during the period of developing monopoly capitalism is described by Braverman (1974). This deskilling and degradation of labor is said to have certain benefits for capital: (1) it decreases the cost of labor, (2) while increasing productivity and (3) increasing management's control over the labor process. The fact that it is in these kinds of jobs that women have increasingly been employed over the course of the 20th century goes a long way to explain the increase in female employment in the US, especially post World War II.

But, if men have also been subject to the degradation process, how does it work differently for women?—i.e. to women's disadvantage? First, Dubnoff (1979) shows us that while both men and women may have moved into more simplified jobs, men were still recruited throughout the 1940-1970 period into jobs "which were more desirable than those in which there was a greater relative growth of female labor" (p.18). Second, in a recent government report, the percentage of men's earnings that exceeded women's earnings increased from 56 to 75 per cent between 1955 and 1974. Thus, the earnings gap in constant 1967 dollars between men and women's full-time, year-round wages went from \$1,911 in 1955 to \$3,433 in 1974 (US Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, 1976). Although the labor of both men and women has been cheapened through the general deskilling process, the vast increase of women in the labor force, the internalization of monopoly capitalism, the increase in the cost of living, and so forth, men's labor has not been cheapened so much as women's labor. This has not only given men a greater power in the market

relative to women, but has also maintained traditional sex roles in the home. Most importantly, with such low wages contributed to the family income by women (see Hayghe, 1976), not only are employed women still economically dependent on men, but, if one member of a family is to leave the market, especially for childcare, men's higher wages makes it most unlikely that it will be the men who do so. ^{voluntarily} The cycle is completed when ^A employers justify women's low wages by arguing that women's primary responsibility is caring for children and that their incomes merely supplement those of their husbands.

Third, Blau and Hendricks (1978) found that between 1950 and 1970, where there was movement of one sex into an opposite sex occupational category: (1) men tended to move into women's highest status professions (elementary school teacher, librarian, nurse, and social worker) while women tended to move into only low level male occupations (including postal clerks, bill and account collectors, real estate agents and brokers, hucksters and peddlers). In addition, men not only entered higher level female occupations but did so into the highest levels of these professions: supervisors and principals in elementary schools (Howard, 1975; Poll, 1978), administrators and division heads in nursing departments in hospitals and social work agencies, chief librarians in libraries (Grimm and Stern, 1974; Deckard, 1975, 1979; Patterson and Engelberg, 1978).

Fourth, men clearly benefit from technological changes with rationalization relative to women. Technology polarizes work so that most jobs are degraded, but simultaneously creates a few higher skilled jobs (Braverman, 1974). With typically female jobs being deskilled

generally, it is often men who get these newly created higher skilled jobs. In the case of clerical work, a major female occupation during the 20th century, two independent sets of researchers now tell us that men indeed are reaping the benefits of the higher level jobs created by the reorganization of clerical work (Feldberg & Glenn, 1979, 1980; Wharton & Burris, 1980). This is not new, but has occurred, interestingly enough, throughout the 20th century.

While it is true that the rationalization of clerical work and the impact of new technologies have eliminated some low level,⁵ boring clerical jobs—as proponents of the "traditionalists" or "technology is progress" school argue, it is not true that women clerical workers have benefitted from this. Thus, whatever new higher level clerical jobs become created in this process do not go to either (a) new, more educated women or (b) the lower level displaced clerical women themselves. Rather, men are brought in from the outside.

In the early period of development of mass clerical work (1900-1930), men were brought in as office managers and supervisors. In the more recent period, since the impact of computer technologies in the 1950's, men have been brought in as the technical and professional workers. Thus, these authors have argued, while certain boring, repetitive jobs are eliminated and a relatively few (in comparison) higher level jobs are created, this does not improve the clerical worker's position in the work process. In fact, I would argue, these women's chances in the market are negatively affected and it could be argued represents an example of the intensification of patriarchy in the market.

This pattern has been found to repeat itself in the communications industry (Hacker, 1979), the banking industry (Shanahan, 1976), the

insurance industry (Feldberg & Glenn, 1980), and the computer industry (Greenbaum, 1979) in the US as well as in a variety of industries in England (Phillips and Taylor, 1980).

In summary, the low level, simplified, easily controlled and poorly paid nature of work goes a long way in explaining women's increased labor force participation. This is a long-term process over the 20th century, intensifying post World War II, which affects women and a large number of men. As this process occurs, however, the sex segregation of the labor market, the recruitment of men into supervisory and professional positions newly created by the reorganization of labor in typically female occupations, and the increasing representation of men in higher levels of both lower and higher status "female" occupations are indications that patriarchal relations in the labor force are being maintained, if not strengthened. (See here also Sokoloff, 1980, last section, for an analysis of the material as well as ideological nature of male benefits in bureaucratic organizations in the US.)

Women and Service Work

Another way of looking at the inclusion of women in the 20th century labor force, and particularly post World War II, is to look at the growing nature of service work in our country. In 1900, 7 out of 10 workers were in goods production (actually in agriculture or manufacturing). By 1980, the labor force has shifted to 7 out of 10 workers being employed in service production (Montagna, 1977; "Service Producing Industries...", 1981).

However, unlike the idea that a service society will produce high quality, stable, satisfying and gratifying jobs requiring more skills and training, the majority of service jobs are those characterized by instability, little advancement, limited training, and dead end nature of jobs, poor working conditions, little job security, low pay, and the like, or what are called secondary as opposed to primary market jobs. A service oriented society, says Montagna (1977), is thus one with predominantly secondary market jobs. He continues:

Using dual labor market theory to analyze the occupational structure, one significant finding is that an increasing number of secondary jobs are in the service producing sector of the economy...This puts an entirely different light on what is happening in the post industrial or service society. According to dual labor market analysis, if we are to be a service-producing society, we are to be a society of mostly secondary jobs (p.71).

Thus, he shows that even though two-thirds (65 per cent) of all employed White women work in white collar jobs (and thus it has been assumed the "better" jobs), 70 per cent of these same women are found in secondary sector jobs. The situation is considerably worse for Black and Latina women (Only 35 per cent Black and 48 per cent Latina women work in white collar jobs, and as high as 83 per cent Black and 80 per cent Latina women are found in the secondary job market) (Montagna, 1977, p.139). Moreover, if one argues that professional, technical and managerial jobs are the highest status and best paying jobs, then it is hard to argue that a service producing society provides the "best jobs" possible to the majority of the people. Between 1900 and 1980 the percent of jobs in these occupational categories only increased from 10 per cent to 26 per cent (Montagna, 1977, p.22). While this represents a substantial increase, the jobs hardly represent "the American worker" - man or woman, White or Black.

It is true that we are a heavily service-oriented society today. Between 1950 and 1980 when overall employment increased 114 per cent in the US, service industries skyrocketed: employment in service trades (such as hotels and motels, laundry services, beauty shops and janitorial services) increased 228 per cent; in restaurants, bars and fast food places 220 per cent; in finance, insurance and real estate 173 per cent; wholesale and retail trades 119 per cent; and government employment rose by 170 per cent, with greatest increases in state (227 per cent) and local government (169 per cent). By contrast, jobs declined by 5 per cent in the automobile industry, 14 per cent in mining and 34 per cent in general manufacturing (Serrin, 1981).

Since 1970, two out of every three jobs created in the US have been in finance, insurance, service trades, and government. This has also been the period of the largest increase of women in the labor force, with over 1 million women, on the average, entering the job market each year during the 1970's. During that period 90 per cent of all new jobs to women were in the service industries; and by 1979, more than 4 out of every 5 (81 per cent) of all employed women worked in service producing industries ("Service Producing Industries...", 1981).

A clarification of the meaning of service type jobs is in order here. There are at least 3 ways in which the term "service" employment is typically used. From the least to most inclusive these are:

(1) Service trades. In the Bureau of the Census listing of occupations, one of the major occupational categories is "service" work. This category includes low status workers who provide services in the market, such as

workers in the service trades: laundry worker, beautician, janitor, apartment superintendent, bartender, hospital aide, hospital attendant, cook, waitress, maid in hotel or motel, etc. Domestic workers in private households are usually classified separately but may be included in the general "service" occupation category. It is important to remember that, used this way, this category does not include high status service workers such as doctors, lawyers, nurses, teachers, etc. who are instead classified as professional and technical workers nor sales and clerical workers—even though they provide important services. The "service" category in the occupational classification scheme represents only 17 per cent of all workers in 1979, three-fifths (59 per cent) of whom are women (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 2080, 1980). Moreover, Black women are disproportionately represented in this low status occupational category (37 per cent Black women vs 19 per cent White women in 1977) (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1979, p. 218).

(2) Service Industries. In the Labor Department's nonagricultural industries, service industries include personal services, business services, hotels, motels and tourist courts, health service and other miscellaneous services. The workers in these service industries represent about one-third of private industry workers (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 2080, 1980).

(3) Service Producing Sector of the economy. This is the most inclusive category and typically includes the service trades, of course, but also: business services; personal services; transportation, public utilities and communication; health, education, and research; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance and real estate; as well as government.

It is here where we find 70 per cent of the nonagricultural workers in the US in 1979 ("Service Producing Industries....," 1981).

Thus, people employed in service industries and the service sector come from many different occupational categories as defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). In fact, some people in the BLS service occupational category do not necessarily work in service industries (e.g., a cafeteria worker in an autoplant).

Why Have Services Increased?

We have seen that the degradation and patriarchalization processes relating to women in the labor market provide greater profits, productivity and control to capitalists, with certain other material and ideological benefits to men over women. How does the increase of service work fit in here?

The service sector increases (1) to absorb workers thrown off from working in or entering in goods producing jobs, (2) to expand new areas of profitability for capital, and (3) to limit hardship on profits during economically difficult times. This is accomplished by increasingly hiring women in low wage and less than year-round and full-time work in the service sector. Since World War II this has expanded to include married women and mothers of young children.

Braverman (1974) argues that with the conquest of goods production by the commodity form (i.e., what had been made in the home like soap, food, clothes, now had to be bought on the market), there was a need for big business to look for new sources of profits and new ways to absorb those laborers no longer needed with the introduction of new technologies in the goods production industries. Despite the technological and

organizational displacement of workers in the rationalization process, capital needs people to be employed: otherwise profits are not possible if people cannot buy the commodities capital produces. Faced with this contradiction, capital commodifies more and more things and relations as the process of the "universalization of the market" takes over in monopoly capitalism. The principle of the "universal market" extends to services that previously had been performed in the home. Thus, Braverman argues, we must purchase such essential services as nursing, teaching, training for jobs, cleaning, cooking, hospitality, maintenance of multiple dwelling units, etc. all of which were previously done in the home.

Of course, this does not mean there is nothing for women to do in the home. Rather, the tasks that women perform in the home change over time. For an analysis of the changing nature of women's work in the home, see Bose (1979), Cowan (1976), Ehrenreich & English (1978), J. Rothschild (1979). Only if an activity is profitable to capital will it be performed in the market. Hartmann (1974) discusses how clothes washing was put back in the home in the early part of the 20th century instead of a commodified service in the market because of its insufficient profitability for capital. Weinbaum and Bridges (1976) talk about the substitutability of women's labor in the home or in the market depending on the nature of the economy at particular points in time.

Most importantly, it has been argued, service industry jobs have increased post World War II because they act as a hedge against recession. According to Bowers (1981), an analysis of the seven post World War II recessions shows that the increasing proportion of service sector jobs that have materialized since World War II have "moderated overall

employment declines" (p.15) In fact, the unexpected ability of New York City to pull through the current economic crisis has been attributed to the credit of the service industries ("Jobs in Services Lead NYC Recovery....," 1980).

Why does this happen? Because "the services industries generally exhibit low productivity growth, less technological advancement, and have a high ratio of direct labor to machines; hence employment growth is not surprising, even during an economic contraction" (Bowers, p.17). In short, these are cheap, labor intensive industries which help keep the economy going as the goods producing sector employment is held constant or contracts. (Note: Be careful to not interpret recession as a protection against unemployment for women.)

Further, continues Bowers, government helps to prop up service employment. Thus, "of equal significance [to service industries being more recession proof than goods industries—especially over the past decade] is the source of employment strength in the service sector. Government employment increased in each recession with especially large gains in the last two complete recessions [1969-70; 1973-75]" (p.17).

According to Hodson (1978), the state employed almost one-fifth of all wage earners. If one looks at government as an indirect as well as a direct generator of jobs, the state accounts for one-fourth to one-third of employment (Hodson, 1978; O'Connor, 1973). Anderson argues that if one adds the unemployed, the militarily employed or dependent and the government employed, 40 per cent of the officially defined labor force are included (Anderson, 1974).

Most importantly, I want to argue that women have increased their participation in the service producing industry because it is heavily "less than full-time and year-round" (or part-time) work. Why is this "good for business?"

Service Work, Less than Full-Time and Year-Round Work, and Women

Just like the myth that our society needs more skilled workers in a "post industrial" or "middle class" world (Bell, 1973) is the current belief that women are fully employed workers. Until the 1970's, the ideology surrounding women's employment was: women didn't work, if they did it was as marginal workers, for "pin money" and only part-time. Over the past 10 years it has become more acceptable to see women as full-fledged, stable and regular members of the labor force. This is typically supported by the fact that 7 out of 10 employed women work full-time: no more part-timers are women workers. In 1980, 70 per cent of all employed women did in fact work full-time. (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 2080, 1980). Thus, their permanent attachment to the labor force has been argued.

However, the most recent figures indicate that only 44 per cent of all women worked both full-time and year-round (see Table I below). (This is in sharp contrast to four-fifths of all men 25-54 years old). Thus, distinguishing data by part-time versus full-time (the way typically done by the Census and reports based on its data) severely underestimates industries' discouragement of women's more permanent attachment to the labor force. Most importantly, it maintains women

as cheap workers, unable to care for themselves and their children in a decent way. (In what follows, I will use the term "part-time" in quotes when the data from which the analysis comes refers to, or I want to emphasize, "less than full-time and year-round" employment and I will use the term part-time without quotes when the data refers to part-time versus full-time only.)

Not only do part-time workers get paid 29 per cent less per hour, on the average, than full-time workers in the same job (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1980a), but 35 per cent of wages spent in fringe benefits (in addition to one's wages) are not expended by business when women do not work full-time and year-round. Less than year-round full-time workers have been found to reduce unemployment insurance costs and to increase productivity in certain cases (Flint, 1977). In short, employing women as less than full-time and year-round workers makes them: (1) cheap workers, (2) keeps women attached to their homes and their domestic and childrearing responsibilities, (3) makes women dependent on men, and (4) keeps women attached to the labor force but simultaneously available for greater inclusion (or exclusion) as needed by capital.

Further, not only is "part-time" work beneficial to owners, but discussions of part-time and temporary workers carry with them the following advantages for business: they are said to be "eager" workers, hard to organize, can help to maintain high office morale by farming out dull and boring work routines to "temps" and part-timers, can control workers by putting them on temporary lines until they "prove" themselves, and they can even increase productivity as well as office morale (Flint, 1977; Samuelson, 1977; Fowler, 1980). As one manager says about his part-timers, mostly

Table 1. Percent Employed Women Working
Year-Round and Full-Time in
Each Occupation, 1960 and 1978

	Percent Employed Women Work Year-Round and Full-Time	
	1960	1978
Professional-Technical	42*	54
Manager-Administ.	62	66
Sales	26	26
Clerical	51	51
Craft	57	49
Operatives, including		
Transport	38	44
Nonfarm Laborers	32	31
Service (not including		
Private Household)	30	28
Private Household Service	19	12
Farm	9	22
TOTAL	37	44

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin
2080, 1980, Table 19.

*This should read: 42% of all women employed as Professional and Technical
workers work both full-time and year-round in 1960. Therefore, 58% do not.

Black women: "Loyalty? Absolute loyalty...We run 3 per cent absenteeism against 8 per cent in the corporation over all. And we're profitable." (Quoted in Flint, p.56).

Between 1940 and 1970, a 40 per cent increase in the number of employed women was in part-time work (Leon & Bednarzick, 1978). And between the mid 1960's and 1970's, one-half of all women entering the labor force did so as part-timers. What is significant here is that women employed between the ages of 25 and 44 years old outnumbered men 7 to 1 in part-time work (Flint, 1977). (Further, although in 1940, men far outnumbered women part-timers, the opposite was true in 1970. See Leon & Bednarzick, 1978.) Today, 2 out of 3 of all part-timers are women (Howe, 1977). Finally, rapid post World War II growth in employment in service industries has provided the bulk of work in part-time jobs during the past decades. And the fastest growth rates within services are in those very industries with the highest percent of voluntary part-time jobs (e.g., low level services, finance, insurance, real estate, wholesale and retail trade.) (For a discussion of "temporary" workers industries, organized post World War II to make the work force "more manageable and less costly", see Gannon, 1974).

Clearly, women increasingly want part-time work so they may combine paid employment with their family responsibilities (who else will assume them?). However, when women want full-time and/or year-round employment, it is usually not available. For example, fully three-fourths of all unemployed women want full-time employment but cannot find it.

Women's Service and Part-Time Jobs; Now and in the Future

The question emerges: where have the job increases been since 1970? and where are they going in the 1980's?

In the 1970's, (using occupational categories) the greatest increase for women in the labor force was in clerical jobs (34 per cent of new jobs 1972-1978). Next, but considerably below clerical jobs comes management (20 per cent of the new jobs) and only then high (professional and technical) and low level service work (15 per cent each) ("Women's Work-Changes in the Seventies," 1980). Thus, increases were greatest in low level white collar service jobs (clerical work) with only half as great an increase in high (professional and technical) and low level service jobs.

For the 1980's, though, the situation is predictably increasingly worse—and these predictions were made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics pre-Reagan. The greatest job increases (for all workers—men and women alike) is first expected in low level services (35 per cent of new jobs expected here), with high increases also in sales and clerical work (28 per cent increase in each). Only then comes increases in management (21 per cent), professional and technical work (18 per cent) and crafts-work (20 per cent) (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1980a; Nardone, 1980).

What is so illuminating here is that the places of greatest expected increase in the 1980's have the highest percent of less than full-time and year-round work today (see Table 1). Low level service workers (with the greatest increase expected in the 1980's) are three-fourths "part-time" workers. (Private household workers, still the domain of Black women, is nine-tenths "part-time" work!) Likewise, sales workers are also about three-fourths "part-time" workers. And clerical work, equally as likely to increase as sales work, has only half of its workers on "full-time" jobs. In short, the greatest projected occupational increases are in those categories heavily female, lowest wage and "part-time" or less than full-time and year-round.

These projections are supported by an industrial sector analysis done by E. Rothschild (1981). She found that of all the jobs that materialized between 1973 and 1980 in the private sector, 40 per cent of the new jobs emerged in 3 subsectors of the services and retail trades: eating and drinking places, hospital services and business services.

These "new industries" have short hours, temporary and part-time workers, female employees, dead end jobs, are labor intensive and have less protection and benefits than other industries. Most importantly, the "big 3" industries have the shortest hours and the worst wages. For example, eating and drinking places have the shortest weekly hours of any industry with 26.4 hours worked by the average worker in 1979. This compares to 35.7 hours for the average worker in the private economy and 40.2 hours for manufacturing workers. When it comes to pay, eating and drinking places offer the "lowest average hourly earnings (excluding tips) of any industry" (E. Rothschild, 1981, p.13).

Finally, there is almost no chance for mobility, decision making, and developing skills in these sectors. When we calculate the percent of supervisory workers in 1979, in these sectors only 1 in 10 workers have any such chances. Thus, while manufacturing in general is 72 per cent nonsupervisory positions, this increases to 9 out of 10 of all jobs in highly female intensive, "part-time" new service industries of eating and drinking places (92 per cent nonsupervisory), health services (89 per cent), and business services (87 per cent). This is in stark contrast to chemical industries (57 per cent nonsupervisory), aircraft (54 per cent), and guided missiles industries (32 per cent!)— all heavily male dominated and with greatest opportunities for mobility. Lest any reader forget the importance of the size of these growing industries today, McDonald's food emporium has almost twice as many workers as US Steel (Serrin, 1981).

Conclusion

In sum, women have increased as part of a long-term secular trend--not only in low wage, sex segregated, deskilled jobs with heavily male supervision and control over them. They have also increasingly been recruited into service sector jobs in less than full-time and year-round work. This has allowed capital to expand its profit making activities at the same time that men have been kept relatively better off than women in the labor force both materially and ideologically. However, all this has occurred as

the male's family wage has been eroded by capital, with increasing rapidity since the 1960s. This has allowed capital to recruit a readily available supply of cheap female labor to these jobs at the same time that it has kept women--especially married women and young mothers--as a reserve of labor. This is reinforced by women's material and ideological position as "secondary" worker--or at least being treated as such.

What this means is that so long as women are not generally employed in stable, year-round and full-time primary sector type jobs, the number of hours women are employed in the labor force can be increased or decreased according to capital's needs and women can be relatively easily moved from 1 low skilled, unrewarding, temporary job to another low skilled, unrewarding, temporary job. And, if worse comes to worse, women (or more likely certain groups of women) can be "absorbed" back in the home in their "rightful place" -- as housewives and mothers. This is a philosophy espoused by one of Reagan's favorite conservative theorists, George Gilder, whose book (Wealth and Poverty, Basic Books, 1981) Reagan gave to members of his administration as inauguration presents.

It is within the context of the social-historical theoretical analysis provided in this paper, we would argue, that we can begin to understand and develop strategies to challenge both long-term trends of patriarchal capitalism (which is simultaneously racist) and current and future effects of the Reagan administration as it opposes/affirmative action, a national equal rights amendment, women's control over their bodies, the 1965 voting rights act, welfare, social services, etc.

NOTES

1. Error-no such footnote exists.
2. These results generally hold for racial and ethnic groups in the US too (see Ehrlich, Sokoloff, Pincus, Ehrlich, 1975).
According to the report to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, women represent 51 per cent of the world's population, one-third of the world's labor force, but they get only one-tenth of the world's income and own less than 1 per cent of the world's property. Despite these facts, women are responsible for two-thirds of all hours of work (World Conference of the UN Decade for Women, 1980).
3. While 1 in 6 employed women are heads of households, this rises to 1 in 4 for Black female employees (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1980b).
4. This is echoed by a recent history of the 1900-1930 period of female employment in the US (See Tentler, 1979). Contrary to the idea that jobs outside the home lead to women's emancipation, Tentler argues that paid work often taught working class women more persuasive lessons about the circumscribed female role than did typical experiences in the home—or school or neighborhood social life. Conditions of a sex segregated labor market, lack of a decent living wage, inadequate advancement possibilities and humiliating supervision by male overseers all reinforced the traditional values, behavior, and experience of young women.

5. There is conflicting evidence as to the amount of increase or decrease in clerical positions. Feldberg and Glenn (1980) document several contradictory sets of findings: sometimes there is an increase, sometimes a decrease. However, they warn us that it is important to make distinctions between different levels of analysis. Thus, overall, they find that clerical positions have increased with the impact of rationalization and automation due to overall increases or growth in these industries; but in several examples of specific companies, they found that the numbers of clerical workers decreased. They articulate three levels of analysis: the aggregate labor force and overall organization of work; the labor force and the work process in an organization; and the workers and work process in particular jobs. Generalization from one level of analysis to the next is not advised.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Charles. The Political Economy of Social Class. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Bell, Daniel. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Blau, Francine D., and Wallace E. Hendricks. "Occupational Segregation by Sex: Trends and Prospects." Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, 1978. (To be published in Journal of Human Resources).
- Bose, Christine. "Technology and Changes in the Division of Labor in the American Home." Women's Studies International Quarterly, 2 (1979): 295-304.
- Bowers, Norman. "Have Employment Patterns in Recessions Changed?" Monthly Labor Review, 104 (February, 1981): 15-28.
- Braverman, Harry. Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.
- Brown, Carol A. "Patriarchal Capitalism and the Female-Headed Family." Unpublished manuscript, Boston, 1975.
- Brown, Carol A. "The Political Economy of Sexual Inequality—Draft". Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Boston, 1979.
- Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. "The 'Industrial Revolution' in the Home: Household Technology and Social Change in the 20th Century." Technology and Culture, 17 (January, 1976): 1-23.
- Deckard, Barbara Sinclair. The Women's Movement: Political, Socioeconomic, and Psychological Issues. New York: Harper & Row, 1975, 1979.
- Dubnoff, Steven. "Beyond Sex Typing: Capitalism, Patriarchy and the Growth of Female Employment, 1940-1970." Paper presented at the meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society, New York, March, 1979.
- Easton, Barbara. "Feminism and the Contemporary Family." Socialist Review, 39 (May-June, 1978): 3-10.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara, and Deirdre English. For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women. Garden City: Anchor/Doubleday, 1978.

- Ehrlich, Howard, J., Natalie J. Sokoloff, Fred L. Pincus, and Carol Ehrlich. Women and Men: A Socioeconomic Factbook. Report no. 13. Baltimore: Research Group One, 1975.
- Feldberg, Roslyn L. and Evelyn Nakano Glenn. "Technology and the Transformation of Clerical Work." Paper presented at the Social Science History Association Conference, Cambridge, 1979.
- Feldberg, Roslyn L. and Evelyn Nakano Glenn. "Effects of Technological Change on Clerical Work: Review and Reassessment." Paper presented at the American Sociological Association meetings, New York, 1980.
- Flint, Jerry. "Growing Part-Time Work Force Has Major Impact on Economy." New York Times, April 12, 1977, pp. 1 and 56.
- Fowler, Elizabeth M. "Careers: Temporary Help Being Used More." New York Times, September 24, 1980, p. D19.
- Gannon, Martin. "A Profile of the Temporary Help Industry and Its Workers." Monthly Labor Review, 97 (May, 1974): 44-49
- Greenbaum, Joan M. In the Name of Efficiency: Management Theory and Shopfloor Practice in Data-Processing Work. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1979.
- Grimm, James W., and Robert N. Stern. "Sex Roles and Internal Labor Market Structures: The 'Female' Semi-Professions." Social Problems, 21 (June, 1974): 690-705.
- Hacker, Sally. "Sex Stratification, Technology and Organizational Change: AT&T." Social Problems, 26 (June, 1979): 539-57.
- Hartmann, Heidi. "Capitalism and Women's Work in the Home." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1974.
- Hayghe, Howard. "Marital and Family Characteristics of Workers, March 1977." Monthly Labor Review, 101 (February, 1978): 51-54, with supplementary tables.
- Hodson, Randy. "Labor in the Monopoly, Competitive, and State Sectors of Production." Politics & Society, 8 (1978): 429-80.
- Howe, Louise Kapp. Pink Collar Workers: Inside the World of Women's Work. New York: Avon Books, 1977.

"Jobs in Services Lead New York City Recovery: Business and Professional Services Identified as Key Growth Sectors." U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Middle Atlantic Region, New York. NEWS Release, April 21, 1980.

Leon, Carl, and Robert W. Bednarzik. "A Profile of Women on Part-Time Schedules." Reprinted from Monthly Labor Review (October, 1978), pp. 3-12. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Montagna, Paul. Occupations and Society: Toward a Sociology of the Labor Market. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1977.

Nardone, Thomas. "The Job Outlook in Brief." A reprint from Occupational Outlook Quarterly (Spring, 1980), pp. 2-21.

O'Connor, James. The Fiscal Crisis of the State. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1973.

Patterson, Michelle, and Laurie Engelberg. "Women in Male-Dominated Professions." Women Working. Edited by Ann H. Stenberg and Shirley Harkess. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publ. Co., 1978.

Phillips, Anne and Barbara Taylor. "Sex and Skill: Notes Towards a Feminist Economics." Feminist Review, 6 (1980): 79-88.

"Population Trends that Add Muscle." Business Week. June 30, 1980, pp. 11-12. (Special Issue on the Reindustrialization of America).

Rothschild, Emma. "Reagan and the Real America." New York Review, February 5, 1981, pp. 12-18.

Rothschild, Joan A. "Technology, 'Women's Work,' and the Social Control of Women." Paper presented at Women and Society: A Symposium, St. Michael's College, Winooski, Vermont, 1979. Revised version to appear in Women, Politics and Social Development, Edited by Margharita Rendel, London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Samuelson, Barbara. "Temps: The Help That's Here to Stay." New York Times, May 22, 1977, p. 13.

Serrin, William. "Work Experts, Disputing Reagan, Cite Risks of Predicting New Jobs." New York Times, March 18, 1981, pp. 1 and 24.

"Service Producing Industries Account for Bulk of 11½ Million 1970's Rise in Jobs Held by Women." U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Middle Atlantic Region, New York. NEWS Release, January 8, 1981.

Shanahan, Eileen. "Jobs in Big Banks Found Hard to Get for Minority Men." New York Times, December 13, 1976, pp. 57 and 61.

Sokoloff, Natalie, J. Between Money and Love: The Dialectics of Women's Home and Market Work. New York: Praeger Publ. Co., 1980.

Tentler, Leslie Woodcock. Wage-Earning Women: Industrial Work and Family Life in the United States, 1900-1930. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. The Social and Economic Status of the Black Population in the United States: An Historical View, 1790-1978. Current Population Reports. Special Studies, Series P-23, No. 80, 1979.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. "Women in the Labor Force: Some New Data Series" (Report 575). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1979.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Perspectives on Working Women: A Databook. Bulletin 2080. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1980.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. "Job Options for Women in the 80's." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1980a.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. "20 Facts on Women Workers." Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, 1980b.

Weinbaum, Batya, and Amy Bridges. "The Other Side of the Paycheck: Monopoly Capital and the Structure of Consumption." Monthly Review, 28 (July-August, 1976): 88-103.

Wharton, Amy and Val Burris. "Clerical Work as Women's Work: The Organization and Development of Female Labor." Paper presented at the University of California Santa Cruz Conference on the Labor Process, Santa Cruz, March 1980.

World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace. Women 1980, Newsletter No. 7. New York: United Nations Headquarters.